

## REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of March 17, 2004 in which claims 1-14 were rejected. A telephone message was left with the Examiner on May 3, 2004 advising that we have not received the initialed PTO-1449 checked off by the Examiner on the Office Action Summary Sheet. It was requested that the Examiner fax us a copy of the initialed PTO-1449 and we have received same by fax on May 10, 2004. The undersigned thanks the Examiner for providing a copy of the initialed PTO-1449 by fax.

Regarding the novelty rejection of claims 1, 4, 7, 11-14 as being anticipated by Schessel (US 6,304,566), it is noted that Schessel does not actually show the claimed signaling with an access code indicative of a feature.

The reference shows a features data base 32 within a central office 16a. An administrative data base 30 contains information on both non-IP and IP subscribers including information as to which features they are subscribed to. When an IP device attempts to get access to the central office it sends IP packets with both its own subscriber information and the called party's number. The central office uses this information to set up the call as shown in Figure 2 of Schessel as detailed on the left-hand side with steps 218 through 226 and continuing with steps 208 through 216. The decision block 12 exists for the purpose of finding out if the calling party has set an internet flag to yes or no to find out if the call is an internet call or not. If so, it is handled in step 216 as an internet call and if not it is handled as a regular PSTN call in step 214.

Schessel's description does not actually disclose signaling from the IP device with an access code indicative of a feature. Therefore, the claims do not "read-on" Schessel simply because Schessel does not disclose any details of the IP device accessing the features database 32 as is covered by the present disclosure

and claims. Independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 are all limited to the IP device signaling an access code indicative of a feature.

The E.164 signaling referred to by the Examiner only describes the features subscribed to by the calling party and not any particular access code indicative of a feature provided for actually accessing said feature. Rather, the E.164 communication is a preliminary set up procedure that certainly might be followed by such an actual access code signaling for accessing a feature by and IP device but such is not actually shown or described by Schessel in the identical sense required by 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Nonetheless, claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the non-IP equipment is a private branch exchange (PBX), that the features are provided to extensions connected thereto, and that the bridge is connected to the private branch exchange as a PBX extension thereof.

As compared to the Schessel disclosure, the amended claim 1 is now clearly distinguished by allowing the objects of the present invention to be deployed by enterprises that have made considerable investment in PBX equipment, who are fully satisfied with the functional advantages the PBX has to offer, but who nonetheless wish to realize the benefits of new IP telephony solutions in remote offices or for teleworkers who can now do so, according to the present invention, without sacrificing the structure and the investment the existing PBX infrastructure.

Such remote offices or teleworkers moreover use the claimed feature of claim 2 to signal with an access code after they signal with a remote hookflash. Such is not shown or even suggested by Schessel. Furthermore, there is no hint or suggestion of a remote hookflash sent from a non IP device to the bridge.

Regarding independent claim 4, although, as mentioned above, Schessel does not actually show transmitting an access code and converting same to access a

feature, claim 4 has been canceled and its limitations incorporated in claim 5, not rejected on this ground. Claim 5 will be discussed in the next section.

Regarding independent claim 7, it contains the limitation that the claimed system has equipment providing telephony connections as well as telephony- related features accessible to a plurality of telephones connected as extensions thereof. The central office 16a of Schessel does not meet this limitation since the SOBs 18 of the central office are not extensions but rather full subscriber numbers as indicated by the E.I64 signaling. Thus, the limitation of claim 7 may be read onto Fig. 1 of the present disclosure to illustrate a relay device (10) is connected as at least one extension of the claimed equipment (14). Consequently, the claimed 1 or more IP devices are able to provide a remote access signal to the relay device (10) over an IP network for accessing features of the equipment (14) at said at least one extension, eg, extension 7150 or extension 7151.

Regarding independent claim 14, as mentioned previously, Schessel does not show or even suggest a feature access code subsequent to a remote hookflash signal. As explained in the specification, a hookflash means that the user will momentarily depress the switchhook or will hit a flash button on a telephone so equipped. After doing that, the user also presses a key such as the pound key or some other key sequence following the hookflash to indicate the feature access code.

Again none of this is shown or suggested by Schessel.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claims 1, 4, 7, 11-14 is requested.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8-10 as being unpatentably obvious over Schessel, Schessel does not disclose a remote hookflash (31) signaled from an IP device to a bridge. As explained at page 10, lines 17-19, a hookflash procedure means that the user will momentarily depress the switchhook

or hit a flash button on a telephone so equipped. This is not shown or even suggested by Schessel.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 2-3, 5-6 and 8-10 is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of March 17, 2004 having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-3 and 5-14 to issue is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Francis J. Maguire". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Francis J. Maguire

Attorney for the Applicant

Registration No. 31,391

FJM/djc

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS

& ADOLPHSON LLP

755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224

Monroe, Connecticut 06468

(203) 261-1234